

### **REMARKS**

This Second Preliminary Amendment is being submitted to supplement a Preliminary Amendment earlier filed with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

#### **Amendment of the Claims**

Claims 1 through 37 have been canceled, and by this Paper, independent claim 38 is amended.

#### **Status of the Claims**

Newly presented claims 39 through 53 have been added. Thus, claims 38 through 53 are pending in the application.

#### **Outstanding Issues**

Subsequent to an Oral Hearing held on 5 April 2007, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences issued a *Decision On Appeal* affirming the Examiner's rejection of the claims set forth in the final Office action mailed on the 1<sup>st</sup> of July 2004 (Paper No. 11).

Specifically, claims 14 through 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ishii (JP410116165A) for the reasons stated in section 4 on pages 2-4 of the final Office Action (Paper No. 11) mailed on the 1<sup>st</sup> of July 2004.

In its *Decision On Appeal*, the Board wrote that,

“thus, the artisan may clearly view such server [30] as a controller of each computer as well as of each printer since the server clearly functions to perform the functions corresponding to the disclosed controllers 20 of each host computer as well as the disclosed controller 30 of each printer in figure 2 as disclosed.”<sup>1</sup>

Applicant has discovered that,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Decision On Appeal*, page 4.


“when a print operation is performed in such a way that a selected network printer relays print data to another network printer and the latter network printer performs the print operation using the print data, the efficiency and applicability of print operation suffers because only a network printer of the same type can be selected for this case.”<sup>2</sup>

Applicant's system defined by newly presented claims 38 through 53 collectively enables each of a plurality of computers to individually avoid the detrimental effect upon efficiency and applicability cause by reliance upon a single host computer, or in alternative configurations, a server, such as is taught by Ishii JP 410116165A, which effectively create a bottleneck.

In view of the foregoing explanation and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition to be passed to issue. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's attorney.

No fee is incurred by this Paper. Should any fee be incurred however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 02-4943 of Applicant's undersigned attorney in the amount of such fees.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert E. Bushnell,  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N. W.,  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56085  
Date: 6/29/07  
I.D.: REB/kf

---

<sup>2</sup> Applicant's original specification, page 4, lines 4-8.